

1993-1994

CSPA

College Student Personnel Association of New York State, Inc.
Post Office Box 22502, Albany, New York 12222

JOURNAL

A state division of the American College Personnel Association

COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

OF

NEW YORK STATE

EDITORIAL BOARD

Mr. Louis Copertino
Director of College Union,
Commuter Life, and Activities
SUNY at Farmingdale
Farmingdale, New York 11735

Dr. Timothy Galtineau
Adjunct Professor
Student Personnel Administration Program
SUNY College at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14222

Dr. James A. Gold
Associate Professor
Educational Foundations Department
SUNY College at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14222

Mr. Joseph S. Franek, Jr.
Director of Residential Life
SUNY College at Brockport
Brockport, New York 14420

Dr. Mary L. Roark
Professor
SUNY College at Plattsburg
Plattsburg, New York 12901

Dr. Marion Schrank
Vice President for Student Affairs
SUNY College at Brockport
Brockport, New York 14420

EDITOR

Dr. Thomas J. Quatroche
Chair, Educational Foundations Department
Coordinator, Student Personnel Administration Masters Program
SUNY College at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14222

EDITORIAL STAFF

Mrs. Carol A. Kozlowski
Technical Editing Assistant
SUNY College at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14222

COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

OF

NEW YORK STATE

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS
1994

PRESIDENT

Dennis McDonald
The College of Saint Rose

Past President
Geneva Walker-Johnson
SUNY at Albany

President - Elect
Denise Collins
SUNY at Cortland

Vice President for Conferences
Steve Gairme
SUNY at Albany

Vice President for Conferences - Elect
Christine Strong
SUNY at Potsdam

Vice President for Professional Development
Wendy Neifold Wheeler
The College of Saint Rose

Vice President for Professional Development - Elect
Pete Libman
Columbia University

Membership Chair
John Ellis
The College of Saint Rose

Secretary
Laurie Gallup
The College of Saint Rose

Treasurer
Susan Patts
Hudson Valley Community College

Newsletter Editor
Ed Englebride
SUNY at Plattsburg

CSPA JOURNAL

GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPT PREPARATIONS

The CSPA Journal welcomes manuscripts based on research dealing with student developments, professional issues, administrative concerns, and creative programs to improve student services. Manuscripts may focus on original research, replication of research, reviews of research, or essays on theoretical organizational and professional issues. For the CSPA Journal, research articles should stress the underlying issues of problems that stimulated the research, should treat the methodology concisely, and should offer a full discussion of the results, implication, and conclusions. CSPA also encourages the submissions of thoughtful essay, statements of positions, and historical overviews.

1. Prepare the manuscripts in accordance with the APA Publication Manual, 3rd Edition, 1983.
2. Send the original and seven copies of the manuscript to the Editor (typed on 8 1/2 x 11 paper, 2500 word maximum); along with the manuscript on a 3 1/2 high density disk in Wordperfect 5.2.
3. Place the author's name, position, and institutional affiliation on the separate title page.
4. Double space all portions of the manuscript including references, tables, figures, and quotations.
5. Use the APA reference style, listing only references cited in the text.
6. Proofread your manuscript before submission for grammatical errors.
7. Submit only those manuscripts not under consideration by another journal.

During the editorial review it is sometimes necessary to make changes that are consistent with the Journal format and publications procedures. The CSPA Journal Editorial Staff reserves the right to make these changes as deemed appropriate.

JOURNAL OF
COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION
OF NEW YORK STATE

VOLUME 10, NUMBER 1

1993/1994

Post-College Educational and Employment Activities of Students Who Leave College Without a Degree	1
Robert T. Georgia	
Campus Trends in Health and Wellness: A Four Year Analysis	8
Catherine G. Ansuini Juliana L. Wolfe Robert S. Wolfe	
Offering a Training Workshop For Residence Hall Government	16
Richard Davino Stephen Matthews	
An Assessment of College Student Awareness Of Campus Personnel, Academic Policies, And Student Services	26
Catherine Ansuini Juliana L. Wolfe Robert S. Wolfe	
Back to the Basics on Campus Violence Prevention: The Multidimensional Campus Violence Intervention Model	35
Mary L. Roark	
CSPA Membership Survey Report June 1993	39
John Ellis	

**Post-College Educational And Employment Activities
Of Students Who Leave College Without A Degree**

Robert T. Georgia, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor and
Acting Assistant Dean of
Students and Student Development

A study of college leavers revealed that, for many, dropping out of college signals a change in, but not an end to, their educational and vocational development. Most respondents enrolled in other educational institutions and/or secured full-time jobs after dropping out. Implications for assessment, advisement, counseling, and programming are explored, particularly in reference to the needs of freshman students.

Alexander Astin (1990) has asked, "What about the students, who fail to complete their programs? What good has higher education done for all these dropouts? Are institutions doing all they can to address this problem?" (p. 35) Tinto (1987) and others have shown that there are multiple reasons for departure from college, often having little to do with academic problems or ability. A meta-analysis of studies dealing with the economic value of college education (Leslie & Brinkman, 1988) finds that "although results are somewhat mixed, it appears that the return on less than 4 years of college also is a favorable one" (p. 52). Presumably college leavers acquire at least a partial share in the non-monetary benefits of college education as well, such as enhanced working, family, and living conditions.

For the most part, however, relatively little is known about the short-term activities of college leavers. We still need to know what happens to students who voluntarily or involuntarily leave college prior to completing their degree requirements. Where do they go and what do they do? A systematic effort to deal with the complex issues surrounding retention and attrition must attempt to address these questions, as difficult as they are, because the answers to the questions hold likely implications for interventions on the part of teaching faculty, advisors, counselors, and administrators. As a first step in addressing these questions, a four-

year, public, urban institution located in the Northeast conducted an exploratory post-college-departure study in the latter part of the Spring 1991 semester.

Method

A questionnaire was developed to inquire about former students' post-college educational and employment activities. The registrar provided a list of the approximately 4000 students who did not re-enroll in the Spring 1988 semester or the Fall 1988 semester, despite having been enrolled in the previous semester. The questionnaire was mailed to every fourth student on the list (about 1000). The selection process did not differentiate between those who chose not to re-enroll and those who were debarred from doing so, nor did it differentiate on the basis of grade point average, number of credits completed, or any other academic or social variable.

Of the thousand questionnaires mailed, usable responses were received from 97 respondents. Many questionnaires were returned as "undeliverable" by the postal service, the addressees having moved (sometimes several times) since leaving the College. An effort to perform a telephone follow-up with non-respondents proved not to be cost-effective, and the effort was dropped.

Results

Population Characteristics

Sixty-five percent of the respondents were female. Respondents' ages ranged from 20 to 65, with 40% in the 21-23 year old categories. Thirty-one percent were Black (non-Hispanic), 27% were white (non-Hispanic), 17% Puerto Rican, 12% Hispanic (other than Puerto Rican), 13% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% Native American. [Note: figures will not always add up to 100% due to rounding or to omission of small response categories.]

While at the College, most had been full-time day (51%) or part-time evening (39%) students. Fifty-two percent had started their academic careers at the College, while the rest had transferred into the College from other four-year or two-year colleges. Eighty-five percent were percent were employed all or most of the time they were at the College. When asked their main reason for leaving the College, only 19% blamed academic difficulties, while the others cited personal or family problems (21%), desire to enroll in another program or institution (13%), dissatisfaction with the College (12%), financial difficulties (9%), or other reasons (27%).

Post-College Employment

Eighty-seven percent said that after leaving the College they were not unemployed for any length of time while actively looking for a job. Seventy-one percent of respondents said they were currently working full-time. Most jobs reported were in management/supervision (28%), professional staff (26%), and clerical (22%). Reported incomes ranged from \$4,000 to over \$40,000 a year, with the largest grouping in the categories from \$20,000 to \$29,999 (33%), \$30,000 to \$39,999 (28%), and \$15,000 to \$19,999 (17%). Most respondents reported being somewhat satisfied (46%) or very satisfied (36%) with their jobs.

Of those not working full-time, 50% said the reason was that they were continuing their education, while others said they were looking but unable to find a job (23%), had family responsibilities (13%), had an illness or disability (3%), or had been temporarily laid off (3%).

Post-College Education

Sixty percent of respondents reported that after leaving the College they enrolled in other educational institutions or programs, with 35% going to 4-year colleges, 14% to community colleges, 2% to vocational programs, 1% to graduate or professional programs. Five percent returned to the College and 5% attended "other" institutions.

Of those who enrolled in educational institutions after leaving the College, 52% said they were still enrolled in their programs at the time of the study (3 to 3 1/2 years later), 24% said they had graduated or completed their programs, and 24% said they were no longer enrolled and did not complete their programs. Asked if they intended to resume their education at some point, 96% said they either would do so or had already done so.

Evaluation of the College Experience

Most respondents stated that, in terms of their learning and development, their experience at the College was very valuable (28%) or somewhat valuable (41%). For 23% it made no difference, while 8% found it somewhat harmful and 1% very harmful. If they had it to do all over, 61% said they would come again to the College.

Discussion

Because of the low response rate (slightly less than 10%), the results of the study must be viewed with a cautious discretion. There are obvious questions about the representativeness of the respondents and the generalizability of the data. It is possible that responses were received disproportionately from those who retain a more positive impression of their College experience and/or those who feel more comfortable reporting their "accomplishments" since leaving the College. Further research, with greater resources provided to assure higher levels of validity and reliability, may be able to effect a higher response rate and to isolate and analyze specific variables that will aid our understanding of this phenomenon. Nevertheless, as a first effort at studying this population, the research presents findings that are suggestive of how a certain proportion of students fare after leaving the College without completing a degree.

Recognizing sample limitations, the data seem to suggest that a sizeable percentage of students who leave the College without completing their degree do go on to enroll in other educational institutions or programs and/or manage to find full-time jobs with relatively decent salaries. Therefore, a question of terminology presents itself. Many such students cannot meaningfully be described as "dropouts" since, in terms of their educational and vocational development, their transition out of the College seems to result primarily in a change of venue or direction, and not in a cessation. It appears that for a good many of these students, despite their having chosen or having been obligated to leave the College prior to completing a degree, the College proves to have been a positive experience, functioning as a springboard or a way station on their path to further development. Such students seem to emigrate from the College to what they consider or hope to be greener pastures. Academic "emigrants" may be a better term than "dropouts" to describe these students.

At the same time, the findings suggest that the College can do a better job of reaching out to and helping students who have problems and concerns that ultimately result in their pre-degree departure. Students were generally very positive about the College's academic programs, its reputation, and the quality of its professors. Other responses and open-ended comments, however, indicate that the College needs to make a more concerted effort to improve the "fit" between students and their academic environment. Particular attention accordingly must be given to areas such as academic advisement, counseling, freshman and transfer orientation,

programming, registration, curricular enrichment, course scheduling, faculty sensitivity to students' needs, improved interpersonal relations on the part of administrative and clerical staff, enhanced support services, and a reorganization of attitudes and activities to reflect the multicultural environment in which we live and learn.

The needs of students at the College are similar to those of students at many other institutions of higher education, and recommendations for improvement at the College are applicable elsewhere. How students experience college can have a more profound impact on their persistence than the precollege characteristics they bring along with them (Terenzini & Pascarella, 1978).

A focus should be placed on early and intrusive interventions, beginning in the first semester freshman year, for the purpose of assessing students' needs, concerns, and attitudes and developing appropriate individual and programmatic responses. Proactive interventions of this kind are required because the students who need support services the most, particularly in their freshman year, are often those who are least likely to utilize them (Levin & Levin, 1991), and students who do not feel a close "fit" with the College are less inclined to seek out counseling and guidance from within the institution on their own.

In light of the numbers and destinations of college leavers, special consideration should be given to improving and expanding academic advisement, vocational guidance, and self-discovery programs for new students in order to assist them in developing realistic and attainable career goals related to their educational interests. With the help of such programs, students' commitment to the institution and to academic success could be increased, resulting in a higher rate of persistence. For those who determine that the institution is not the right place for them, meaningful and viable alternatives might be explored early on to minimize what could otherwise be a misplaced investment (for both student and college) of time, effort, and resources.

Institutional endeavors should be directed toward evaluating the student-environment relationship and strengthening the bond between student and institution. The goals, as Alexander Astin (1990) says, should be "to develop a comprehensive database, to conduct more and better talent assessments (and to use the results in program planning and review), to increase faculty-student contact, and to increase student involvement through the use of more active modes of learning" (p. 40).

Such improvements may spare many students the inconvenience, the disruption, and the frequent personal trauma of having to leave a college and start their educational and vocational quests anew elsewhere. Improved retention is, of course, in a college's best interest as well. Today's students, including those who exit without a degree, are for the most part industrious and eager to learn and progress. We must recognize that "the complex nature of decisions to leave an institution involve[s] both individual and institution" (Boyle, 1989, p. 289). By understanding our students' career trajectories, by analyzing and remediating our own institutional shortcomings, and by developing new and improved approaches, we can help them better to succeed and to complete their term of learning at their college of first choice.

References

- Astin, A. (1990, Fall). Can state-mandated assessment work? Educational Record, 34-40.
- Boyle, T. P. (1989). An examination of the Tinto model of retention in higher education. NASPA Journal, 26(4), 288-294.
- Leslie, L. L., & Brinkman, P. T. (1988). The economic value of higher education. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Levin, M. E., & Levin, J. R. (1991). A critical examination of academic retention programs for at-risk minority college students. Journal of College Student Development, 32 323-334.
- Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (1978). The relation of students' precollege characteristics and freshman year experience to voluntary attrition. Research in Higher Education, 2, 347-366.
- Tinto, V. (1987). Leaving college. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campus Trends in Health and Wellness: A Four Year Analysis

Catherine G. Ansuini, Ed.D.

Assistant Professor
Health, Physical Education and Recreation
SUNY College at Buffalo

Julianna L. Woite, M.S.

Coordinator of Substance Abuse Prevention
Prevention Resource Center
SUNY College at Buffalo

Robert S. Woite, M.S.

Psychology Department Assistant
Department of Graduate Studies
SUNY College at Buffalo

The present study addressed trends in health and wellness practices of students enrolled at a mid-sized state university. In the spring of four consecutive years, students responded to a 30 question Student Health and Wellness Questionnaire. Data was collected concerning health related behaviors, nutritious intake and stress perceptions. Results revealed consistent problematic areas of student health related behaviors combined with trends specific to each particular year. Programming resolutions include the formulation of a core program supplemented with a criteria specific component designed to meet the needs of distinctive student groups.

Introduction

It is customarily accepted that the six dimensions of wellness are spiritual, occupational, social, physical, intellectual, and emotional well-being (Hettler, 1980; Roberts, 1993). A standard and comprehensive program bringing these issues to the classroom, however, has yet to unfold. Debate has arisen as to a student's self-responsibility for wellness needs (McConatha, Shepherd & McConatha, 1990), the proper marketing strategy for a wellness program (Seaward & Snelling 1990), and the most important characteristics of a wellness instructor (Jibaja-Rush,

students experiencing serious or intense stress. A girlfriend/boyfriend or spouse ranked third with 21% of subjects under serious or intense stress. A subject's roommate was close behind with 19% of subjects under this amount of stress. Parking and the administration were tied for fifth place with 17% of subjects reporting serious or intense stress with these issues. Advisement concluded the list with 15% of all subjects reporting serious or intense stress around this issue.

Twenty two percent of subjects reported their goal to be the completion of a Master's Degree or Doctorate. Sixteen percent of subjects wanted to find a "good" job. Finally, when subjects were asked to indicate how they felt about themselves, 14% reported only liking themselves a little to not liking themselves at all.

To investigate trends in subject response, a series of One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVAs) were then computed between each question and the year (see Table 1.0). Results indicated a number of differences. First, three demographic trends had taken place. The amount of subjects in relationships differed significantly [$F(3, 1373) = 6.03, p < .05$] between the years. In 1991 ($\bar{x} = 2.44$) significantly less people were married or in relationships than in 1992 ($\bar{x} = 2.27$) and 1993 ($\bar{x} = 2.21$). Responsibility also differed [$F(3, 1371) = 6.29, p < .05$]. In 1991 ($\bar{x} = 1.37$) subjects were responsible for less people than in 1990 (1.64), 1992 (1.59) or 1993 ($\bar{x} = 1.78$). Finally, the amount of hours worked was significantly lower in 1990 ($\bar{x} = 4.25$) and 1991 ($\bar{x} = 4.05$) than in either 1992 ($\bar{x} = 4.37$) or 1993 ($\bar{x} = 4.99$) [$F(3, 1374) = 7.23, p < .05$].

Second, two health related behavior trends were found. Regarding hours of sleep per night, 1991 ($\bar{x} = 7.25$) and 1992 ($\bar{x} = 7.39$) slept more hours than either 1990 ($\bar{x} = 6.86$) or 1993 ($\bar{x} = 6.87$) [$F(3, 1373) = 10.03, p < .05$]. The amount of cigarettes smoked a day also differed [$F(3, 1373) = 3.93, p < .05$]. In 1993 ($\bar{x} = 2.95$), subjects smoked significantly more cigarettes than in 1991 ($\bar{x} = 2.21$).

One difference was found between the years and questions targeting nutritious intake behaviors; nutritious meals consumed a day [$F(3, 1376) = 4.67, p < .05$] differed between two of the years. In 1993 ($\bar{x} = 3.12$), subjects ate significantly more nutritious meals than their counterparts in 1990 ($\bar{x} = 2.67$).

Finally, two stress related trends were found. An interesting trend was found with regard to registration [E (3,1329) =5.16, $p < .05$]. It was indicated that 1991 ($\bar{x} = 2.71$) was significantly more stressful than all other years ($\bar{x} = 2.34$, $\bar{x} = 2.45$, $\bar{x} = 2.43$ respectively). A similar trend was found for advisement [E(3,1332) =5.20, $p < .05$]. Again 1991 ($\bar{x} = 2.17$) and also 1993 ($\bar{x} = 2.17$) produced significantly more stress than 1992 ($\bar{x} = 1.90$).

Discussion

As indicated, the years differed qualitatively from each other in many ways. By manufacturing a profile of each year, one can begin to appreciate how these differences could impact a successful curriculum. In the year 1991, for example, students were not in relationships, had less responsibility, and slept more than certain other years. At this time, however, registration and advisement were generating a significant amount of stress. A cursory analysis of this year would indicate that students were reasonably fortunate. Though stress was at its highest point, the quality of the student's lives may have put them in a better position to deal with it. The year 1992, on the other hand, had a significant amount of students working more and sleeping more. The needs of this population are curious. How much free time do they have? When do they study? If a majority of their time is spent working and sleeping, certain facets of their lives are bound to suffer. By 1993, subjects still worked in abundance, but they slept less and ate better. Consequently, this population also smoked more.

Based on this evidence, one could support the position that college students do have differing needs from year to year, and that programming should take these varying needs into account. While students in 1991 may have needed extra counseling on stress management, by 1992, students would have been better served with creative and successful ideas on how to budget their time. In 1993, specific information on the benefits of nutritious meals versus the detriments of smoking would have been a useful discussion topic. For the year 1990, where no significant trends took place, programming could have focused on the pivotal aspects of prevention and training. Perhaps if this would have been done in 1990, some of the negative trends could have been eliminated from the following years.

Aside from these year dependent trends of individual health related behaviors, one also has to recognize the non-fluctuating propensity of others. Alcohol and substance abuse, for

example, is an ever prevalent problem on this campus as well as the national college community. Results indicated that over 70% of students consume alcoholic beverages on a regular basis, and almost half consume more than five drinks a week. To supplement this, over 20% of subjects reported the employment of illegal drugs. For a concern of this magnitude, programming considerations are numerous. Even the diminutive reports of nutritious intake and exercise patterns expressed across subjects indicate another necessary district of general program intervention. Perhaps a logical solution would be to implement a program with a core curriculum focusing on these consistent areas of problematic behavior. This program could then be supplemented with need based criteria derived from preliminary assessment ventures. In combination, these components could serve to positively affect the greatest number of student needs and concerns.

Table 1.0 Significant Trends During the Four Years:

	1990	1991	1992	1993
Significantly		R	S,W	S,R,W,C
Lower		G,A		A
Mean		P,G	P	

Key:
 S = in significant relationships
 P = hours of sleep per night
 G = registration stress
 R = responsibilities
 C = cigarettes per day
 A = advisement stress
 W = work hours per week
 N = nutritious meals per day

References

Brynteson, P., Adams, T. II, & Schollmeier, S. (1990). A university health fitness program revisited. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, September, 73-77.

Hettler, W. (1980). Wellness promotion on a university campus. *Journal of Health Promotion*, 3, 77-92.

Hybertson, D., Hulm E., Smith, W., & Holton, M. (1992). Wellness in traditional-age students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 50-55.

Jibaja-Rusht, M., Kingery, P., Holcomb, J., Pruitt, B., & Buckner, W. (1992). Who should teach school health? Personal and setting characteristics. *Health Values*, 16(5), 47-55.

McConatha, J., Shepherd, S., & McConatha, P. (1990). Assessing the self-responsibility for wellness needs of incoming students. *NASPA Journal*, 27(3), 257-263.

Robbins, G., Powers, D., & Rushion, J. (1992). A required fitness/wellness course that works. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, Feb. 17-21.

Roberts, Scott (1993). *Health and Wellness*. Dubuque, IA: Eddie Bauer.

Seaward, B., & Snelling, A. (1990). A marketing strategy for a campus wellness program. *Health Education*, 21(5), 4-8.

Sivik, S., Butts, E., Moore, K., & Hyde, S. (1992). College and university wellness programs: An assessment of current trends. *NASPA Journal*, 29(2), 136-142.

Offering A Training Workshop For Residence Hall Government

Richard Davino
Residence Hall Director
SUNY College at Plattsburgh

Stephen Mathews
Residence Hall Director
SUNY College at Plattsburgh

Purpose

The purpose of this article is to provide a framework from which colleges and universities can develop and implement a comprehensive training workshop for residence hall governments.

Background

Residence hall living is an integral part of a college student's development. Interaction with other students and the residence hall staff helps to develop a sense of community. Komives (1991) believes that residence halls are complex living-learning environments in which students' learning and satisfaction are enhanced through the facilitation of effective student-staff relationships.

One important way of accomplishing student interaction is by promoting involvement in residence hall government. Participation in residence hall government fosters the opportunity to develop skills in the areas of planning, communication, problem solving, relationship building, and leadership. Astin (1984) believes that the greater a student's involvement in college, the greater the resulting amount of learning and personal development. It is important to take a closer look at these skills in establishing a rationale for offering a Residence Hall Government Training Workshop.

Sawyer (1988) states that through the planning of programs, student government officers experience the challenge of estimating needs, establishing goals, and identifying methods to reach those goals.

Through interaction with the residence hall staff, administration and faculty/staff, residence hall government officers experience the need for efficient oral and written communications (Sayer, 1988).

Effective communication is an important part of the development of students since the ability to speak in front of groups and clearly write one's thoughts are skills which can be used throughout a student's academic and professional life.

Although residence hall governments are designed to be effective sources of leadership and growth opportunities, they are not always problem free. Difficulties can develop between officers and residence hall staff, between residence hall students and officers, and even between the officers themselves. Because of this potential confrontation with the unexpected, residence hall government officers need to develop the skills of patience, flexibility, and resourcefulness.

Residence hall government officers need to identify blocking and supporting characteristics among themselves in order to develop a team approach when working toward common goals (Sawyer, 1988). In developing relationships with each other, the officers can achieve their goals and form a more cohesive team.

The abundance of research on the topic of leadership is an important resource when fostering residence hall government and student development. Miller and Winston (1991) believe leadership is the process of persuasion and example through which an individual, or leadership team, induces a group to take action that is in agreement with the leader's purposes or the shared purposes of all. The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Developmental Programs (CAS) Standards (1986) state that a function of Student Affairs is to provide individual and group educational and growth opportunities in developing an exercising leadership skills.

Cosgrove (1988) stated the following with respect to leadership:
Fundamental to an understanding of leadership is an understanding of the concept of vision or purpose. Leaders lead people

somewhere. They have a purpose or vision which is an internal driving force. There is something they want to accomplish and so are motivated to expend enormous amounts of energy in seeing that something achieved. And they are able to enlist others in the task of achieving it (p. 41).

One of the primary purposes of higher education has been, and remains, the preparation of citizens for leadership positions. With the increasing complexity of society's growing tendencies towards specialization, and the need for leaders to adapt to change, opportunities to participate in leadership activities such as residence hall government, assume even greater importance (Downey, Bosco, & Silver, 1984; Roberts, & Ullom, 1989).

Strifolino and Saunders (1989) note that high performing systems have outstanding leaders who differ in style, but share the characteristics of caring deeply about their organization and its success. It is important to involve students in residence hall government who care deeply about their residence hall. Empowering students to assume leadership roles encourages them to become more involved and to develop a more caring attitude toward their institution.

Clearly there is a need for a comprehensive training program to assist residence hall government officers in developing many of the previously mentioned skills. Student affairs professionals often encourage students to become involved in student government positions without providing them with the necessary training opportunities (Wells, 1988). Along the same lines, student affairs administrators often do not provide the necessary training for residence hall government advisors.

Through this article we share a Residence Hall Government Training Workshop that will address these concerns in the hopes of providing officers and advisors a more enjoyable and fulfilling experience.

Goals and Objectives of the Workshop

A major goal of this training workshop is to teach residence hall government officers and their advisors how to successfully fulfill their positions. This goal will be met by accomplishing the following objectives:

1. Teach each officer and advisor about their specific responsibilities.
2. Show officers and advisors how they can fulfill those responsibilities.
3. Give the officers and advisors the skills and support necessary to fulfill their responsibilities.

A secondary goal for this training workshop will be to help residence hall governments overcome common problems they may experience. This goal will be accomplished by meeting the following objectives:

1. Teach officers and advisors methods of overcoming apathy.
2. Educate officers and advisors regarding the planning and publicizing of activities.
3. Train officers and advisors how to build effective and cohesive teams.
4. Teach officers and advisors about the need for developing effective communication skills.

Workshop Design

In order to achieve the aforementioned goals, we propose a one day workshop to take place within the first two weeks of the residence hall government officers' team. Prior to explaining the benefits of each of the events and/or sessions, an agenda for the entire workshop is provided. Each of the events will be explained in greater detail following this agenda.

Residence Hall Government Training Workshop Agenda

9:45 a.m.	Registration
10:15 a.m.	Welcoming Address
	-- Door prizes
10:30 a.m.	Team Building Exercises
11:00 a.m.	Individual Officers Meetings
12:00 Noon	Lunch
	-- Keynote Speaker
	-- Prizes

1:00 p.m. Session I

1. Building Group Dynamics
2. Communication Skills

2:00 p.m. Session II

1. Building Group Dynamics
 2. Programming & Creative Publicity
 3. Motivation & Dealing with Apathy
- 3:00 p.m. Individual hall meetings to reflect, begin planning for the semester, and evaluate the workshop.

Advisors will meet at 11:00 a.m., 1:00 p.m., and 2:00 p.m., separate from the rest of the residence hall government, for specialized training.

Registration

Three primary purposes for having a registration period are to pick up materials packet, to note the number of attendants, and answer any questions. The materials packet includes a schedule (agenda) of events, and residence hall government handbooks, officer and advisor editions, which will be explained in further detail later.

Welcoming Address

Following the registration period there will be a brief opening address/welcome from the workshop coordinator. In addition to this address, door prizes would be handed out to both show appreciation and raise the interest of those in attendance.

Team-Building Exercise

An example of a team-building exercise which could be used in a game called, "Have You Ever?" Workshop participants (residence hall government officers), under the instruction of the advisors, will break into groups ranging in size from 20-40 and separate to different

rooms; once in the room, they will form a large circle. The advisors will begin by saying "Have you ever..." then read off an accomplishment such as: "... been a captain of an athletic team, played a musical instrument, etc. If a member of the group has done what has been read, they step into the circle and introduce themselves to anyone else in the circle.

Officers Meeting

The purpose of these meetings is to give each officer an overview of what they need to do in their specific area. These meetings would be organized by office, not by residence hall. This should be done so that all of the Presidents would be in the same room, all of the Vice Presidents would be in the same room, and so on.

The advisors will also meet during this time. In the advisor meeting, they will learn the responsibilities of the residence hall government officers, the resources available to student groups, and the potential events the residence hall government might be planning.

Lunch With Speaker

During the meal there will be a brief address by a dynamic speaker, ideally on the topic of leadership and/or involvement. Also during the lunch break, in order to keep the officers involved and make the day more exciting, prizes may be handed out randomly.

Session I

This session consists of three separate workshops. Each residence hall should send at least one representative to each of the workshops. Subsequently, each residence hall's government will benefit from the information presented within that workshop. Each workshop would be limited to 50 minutes and allow for a short break between sessions. The workshops offered during Session I are as follows:

1. Building Group Dynamics. This workshop will teach residence hall government officers how to build an effective team and how to work-out, or work-with conflicts among each other.
2. Communication Skills. Effective verbal and non-verbal communication is demonstrated in this workshop.

3. Time & Stress Management. This workshop will address the problems associated with taking on too much responsibility and the stress that often accompanies it.

During the time that the officers are attending the workshops in Sessions I and II, the advisors will be attending an afternoon meeting. In this meeting, they can discuss the skills pertinent to advising student groups, and specific nuances associate with student governments.

Session II

Session II will be structured in the same manner Session I.

1. Building Group Dynamics. Due to the potential interest and importance of this topic, it will be offered a second time.
2. Programming & Creative Publicity. This workshop offers suggestions regarding activities a residence hall government unit may develop, as well as creative ways to publicize them.
3. Motivation & Dealing With Apathy. This workshop presents strategies to overcome apathy among residents and assists residence hall government officers to effectively deal with their own potential discouragement.

Individual Residence Hall Government Meetings

After the sessions, each residence hall government unit meets with their advisors. This meeting serves three purposes:

1. Reflect and share what has been learned in the workshops.
2. Begin planning for the upcoming semester.
3. Evaluate the workshop.

In addition, prizes should be given out to those members who attended the workshop. This gesture shows institutional support for the residence hall governments, as well as to motivate the officers and advisors.

Residence Hall Government Handbooks

All of the residence hall government officers will receive a residence hall government handbook. The handbook may contain, but need not be limited to:

- residence hall government constitution
- meeting guidelines
- budgeting structure
- programming ideas
- advertising tips
- samples of commonly used paperwork

Each of the residence hall government advisors will receive a residence hall government advising handbook. The handbook could contain, but should not be limited to:

- working with student groups
- characteristics of effective advisors
- roles of the advisor in different situations
- self evaluation
- examples of commonly used paperwork
- evaluation forms

Implementation of the Workshop

The CAS Standards (1986) addresses many factors that need to be considered in implementing this workshop. According to the standards related to Student Activities, "the purpose of the student activities program must be to complement the academic program of studies and enhance the overall educational experience of students through development of, exposure to, and participation in social, cultural, intellectual, recreational, and governance program" (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Developmental Programs, 1986, p. 91). Thus, the student activities functional area should play a leadership role in implementing a residence hall government training workshop.

The CAS Standards (1986) also outline the need for administrative support and adequate funding. Some costs associated with the implementation of this workshop include providing lunch for those in attendance, prizes, and production of the materials packets. Much of the cost associated with the prizes could be reduced by seeking contributions and/or complimentary items from local vendors.

One must also consider the value of utilizing professional staff when implementing a Residence Hall Government Workshop. Their time, leadership, and support are invaluable to the overall success of such a program.

Conclusion

We have examined the importance of having a comprehensive Residence Hall Government Training Workshop by exploring theory associated with the development of students, and by drawing upon some of our own experiences. It has long been felt that involvement in student government has spurred interest in other activities (Downey et al., 1984). We as student affairs professionals need to be aware of this link and assist the students in having a satisfying residence hall government experience that could lead to continued participation in the college community.

References

- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23(4), 297-307.
- Cosgrove, T. (1988). Cleaning up our language about leadership. Campus Activities Programming, 21(3), 40-45.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Developmental Programs (1986). Council standards and guidelines for student services/development programs.
- Downey, R. G., Bosco, P. J., & Silver, E. M. (1984). Long-term outcomes of participation in student government. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(3), 245-250.
- Komives, S. R. (1991). The relationship of hall director's transformational and transactional leadership to select resident assistant outcomes. Journal of College Student Development, 32(6), 509-515.
- Miller, T. K., & Winston, R. B. (Eds.). (1991). Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development Inc.
- Roberts, D., & Ullom C. (1989). Student leadership program model. NASPA Journal, 27(1), 67-74.
- Sawyer, R. (1988). Orientation as a leadership experience. Campus Activities Programming, 21(1), 46-50.
- Strifflino, P., & Saunders, S. A. (1989). Emerging leaders: Students in need of development. NASPA Journal, 27(1), 51-58.
- Wells, R. L. (1988). Designing a leadership retreat. Campus Activities Programming, 21(2), 56-63.

An Assessment of College Student Awareness of Campus Personnel, Academic Policies, and Student Services

Catherine Ansuini, Ed.D.

Assistant Professor
Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Graduate Faculty Advisor
SUNY College at Buffalo

Juliana L. Woite, M.S.

Associate Program Coordinator
Prevention Resource Center
SUNY College at Buffalo

Robert S. Woite, M.S.

Psychology Department Assistant
Department of Graduate Studies
SUNY College at Buffalo

The present study assessed the awareness of 122 college students with regard to campus personnel, academic procedures and student services. A 20 question Student Awareness Survey was administered in a variety of campus locations. Underclassmen, transfer students, undeclared majors, nontraditional students and students participating in a grouped advisement program were compared. Awareness of undergraduate college students in a variety of college related areas was assessed, including knowledge of key college personnel, academic policies and student services. Populations addressed included undeclared, nontraditional and transfer students, as well as underclassmen and students who participated in a grouped advisement experience at the college. It was predicted that students receiving the nationally merited grouped advisement would demonstrate the greatest level of awareness. Results indicated a general lack of knowledge on key campus issues. Analysis of the grouped advisement data revealed that some scores were significantly lower than those of other students. Implications for nontraditional and transfer students are discussed, as well as academic issues related to orientation and advisement.

There is an apparent need for all campuses to be aware of general knowledge their students have of the college at large. Asin (1993) identified three variables that positively affect a student's general knowledge: peer socioeconomic status, social activism, and community orientation. Asin (1993) also noted that students were least satisfied with the quality of student support services and academic advisement. For this reason, student data influencing knowledge acquisition is scrutinized and low student satisfaction ratings for support services and academic advisement are addressed. We contend that inadequate knowledge of support services and delivery of academic advisement may impact student dissatisfaction.

An emphasis is placed on students participating in grouped advisement. This specific program was recently awarded a Certificate of Merit for 1993, bestowed by the American College Testing Service/National Academic Advising Association. The grouped advisement program was initiated in 1989 as a joint project of the College Senate and the academic administration. The intent of the project was to enrich the advisement experience of interested students. This was done by structuring the teaching assignment of volunteer faculty advisors to include one class comprised exclusively of interested freshman. Faculty then worked to develop strong relationships and sound academic advisement with these students for two consecutive years. Marianne Ferguson (1993) supports the achievements of this program. The author notes that participants in this program have higher grade point averages than non-participating freshman and feel more confident about their ability to succeed in college. The grouped advisement program also schedules visits with the Academic Skills Center and the Career Development Center, two agencies addressed in the awareness survey.

The present study investigates whether students participating in the grouped advisement program have significantly greater awareness than non-participants. Given the objectives and practices of this program, it could be considered a valuable tool in the augmentation of college student awareness.

Method

Subjects

Subjects for the present study were 122 students from a state funded school located in the Northeast. Thirty-seven percent of the subjects were male and 63% were female. Seven

percent of subjects reported being in their freshman year of school, 19% were sophomores, 33% were juniors and 41% were seniors. Transfer students represented 42% of the population, and 77% of all respondents had declared a major. Only 10% of subjects reported participating in grouped advisement at the college. The age of subjects ranged from 18 years to over 55 years of age.

Materials/Procedures

A 20 question College Student Awareness Survey was developed. Questions targeted recognition of key college personnel, academic policies, and campus services. Locations of important agencies on campus were also included. Questionnaires were distributed in various buildings across the college campus, including the Student Union. Respondents were informed that participation was voluntary and collaboration on answers was not allowed. Student answers were self recorded on General Purpose NCS Answer Sheets.

Results

The first section of the survey evaluated the subjects knowledge of key campus personnel. Results indicated that for the students selected in the study, less than 75% of the students could name the College President, and less than 45% could name the Chancellor of the SUNY system. Furthermore, a mere 10% of subjects could name their Dean, and only 42% of all respondents chose the name of an actual Dean in their attempt to answer.

With regard to campus policies, only 32% of subjects knew the requirements of the pass/fail option, but 34% of subjects knew how to negate the pass/fail option once obtained. When asked to indicate the requirements needed to withdraw from a course, 42% of subjects could accurately recognize the correct procedures. The final question concerning campus policies addressed the issue of academic advisement. Thought it is emphasized repeatedly, less than 80% of subjects knew that individuals could not register without proper advisement. Eleven percent believed that advisement was not necessary if your advisor gave you "on-going permission" to register. Four percent believed that upperclassmen did not need advisement, and 4% believed that honor students did not need advisement to register for classes.

Campus services were next addressed. When asked where to consult if they were experiencing a reading difficulty, 72% of subjects knew to consult the Academic Skills Center. Of the remaining respondents, 20% indicated that they would consult the "Tutorial Assistance Center," an organization which does not exist on the campus. Next, subjects were asked whom they would approach with questions concerning their student status. Fifty-two percent would correctly consult Records and Registration. Of the remaining respondents, 24% reported that they would go to Academic Affairs, which is a provost and vice president's office. Questions about career choices and job placement were next addressed. A total of 87% of subjects knew to seek out the Career Counseling Center. This was the highest percentage correct for all questions. The final question in this section addressed the Graduate School on campus. Sixty-one percent of respondents knew that the school offered various master's degree programs. However, nearly 20% of subjects believed that their school offered a Ph. D. program, and 8% did not believe that the college even had a Graduate division.

The final section addressed the location of two health related services on campus. An impressive 86% could name the building where the Student Health Center was located. When asked where on should connect to learn more about health and wellness, however, only 68% knew to seek the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

The Chi Square statistic was performed between each question and five groups of students: (1) underclassmen vs. upperclassmen, (2) transfer vs. non-transfer students, (3) undeclared vs. declared students, (4) traditional vs. non-traditional students, and (5) students who have participated in grouped advisement vs. those who have not. Underclassmen were students reporting being either a freshman or a sophomore, and upperclassmen were juniors or seniors. Traditional students were those who answered being between the ages of 18-25 and non-traditional students were those who reported being more than 25 years of age.

When analyzed according to class rank, two significant differences were found. While 85% of upperclassmen could name the College President, only 65% of underclassmen could do the same [$\chi^2(3) = 8.05, p < .05$]. The process by which one negates the pass/fail option also differed. Again, underclassmen (22%) scored significantly lower than upperclassmen (39%) [$\chi^2(5) = 17.09, p < .01$].

Transfer status also elicited differences; knowledge of the Health Center's location was lower in transfer students. While 94% of non-transfer students knew this location, only 79% of transfers indicated a correct answer [$\chi^2(3) = 8.14, p < .05$]. With regard to the withdraw policy, however, transfer students outscored others. Fifty-two percent of transfer students knew the correct procedures, when only 39% of non-transfers did [$\chi^2(3) = 8.88, [0.5]$].

Students who have declared a major differed from students who had not when attempting to name the Chancellor. While only 31% of undeclared students could name the Chancellor, twice as many declared students could (62%) [$\chi^2(3) = 9.59, p < .02$]. There were no other significant differences.

Traditional students differed from non-traditional students in only one area. Knowledge of the Academic Skills Center was significantly higher in traditional students (74%) than non-traditional students (69%) [$\chi^2(3) = 9.59, p < .02$].

Students who had participated in grouped advisement differed from others in three areas. Contrary of the present paper's hypothesis, the grouped advisement students scored significantly lower than others. While only 54% of grouped advisement students could correctly name the College President, 85% of other subjects could [$\chi^2(3) = 15.79, p < .01$]. Finally, knowledge of the Graduate School also differed. While 57% of non-participating students knew about the Graduate School, only 40% of participating students did [$\chi^2(3) = 8.97, p < .02$].

Discussion

In general, student awareness of campus personnel, academic policies, and student services was not exceptional. With respect to knowledge of campus personnel, policies, services, and program locations, no one area appeared to elicit more correct student responses. While the Career Development Center's location was known by the largest percentage of students (87%), the name of the subject's Dean was known by the least (10%). The remainder of campus awareness issues fell somewhere in the intermediate. When assessing reported student awareness, however, one has to consider the difference between recall and recognition. Studies have shown that subjects can recognize a correct response more frequently, rapidly, and with greater accuracy, than they could recall it (Bahrick, 1984; Brown 1976; Schacter, 1987).

Since the present study tested subject's recognition of personnel, policies, and the like, it can be concluded that awareness scores were better than if subject's recall would have been assessed. Implications arise when one deliberates the instances in which students would be most likely to use this knowledge. If one student were to ask another student information regarding a policy, for instance, chances for a correct response would be less likely than reported here. This notion is certainly disturbing. For most of the concepts covered by this survey, their common student usage will more likely be in a recall, rather than recognition form.

The discovery of only one difference between traditional and non-traditional students was encouraging. Much research has concluded that the environment of adult learners needs to be improved, and that more responsive programs should be implemented to increase understanding (Brookfield, 1991) and retention (Chickering, Lynch & Schlossberg, 1989). Rotella (1993) feels that this can be done by simply "being human with adult learners." By any means, the college appears to be responsive to this population. Additional research correlating campus awareness, and the retention rate of adult learners, is strongly suggested.

The trend for transfer students to be both more aware and less aware than non-transfer students, is particularly noteworthy. Most importantly, this suggests that traditional transfer orientation proceedings need to be revised. Rentz (1988) describes typical transfer orientations as focusing on transcript evaluation, academic advising, and registration information. It is not known whether some issues, such as campus building locations, are not covered in the college's transfer orientation, or covered more rapidly and in less detail than in freshman orientations. Transfer students demonstrate less building location knowledge, but better policy information understanding than non-transfer students. For this reason, one could question whether transfer orientations differ qualitatively from traditional freshman orientations. Regardless, differences exits and revision should be considered. It is noted that many inhibitory factors arise when planning a transfer orientation, and that student as well as professional time, is limited. With almost half of the student body consisting of transfer students, however, the college should feel compelled to successfully meet the awareness needs of this very large population. Harrison and Varcoe (1984) suggest that these orientations need to address academic articulation, transition, transportation, finances, and environmental adjustments, as well as developmental needs.

Results did not substantiate the hypothesis that students with a grouped advisement experience would be more aware than other students. Surprisingly, these students scored significantly lower than the rest of the subjects on some questions, and equivalent to other subjects on the remaining questions. This is a curious finding. It would be difficult to conclude whether the program had a negative effect on participant's awareness. However, this seems particularly unlikely. The reason that these students have less awareness is a conundrum. Ferguson (1993) certainly describes a very comprehensive program riddled with opportunities to advance awareness. Perhaps the distortion lies in some inherent fundamental difference in both the students who choose to take the program and the faculty who choose to advise. It must be kept in mind that this is a voluntary program and the possibility exists that the population enrolling, and the population advising, each differ from other students and faculty on the onset. However, Ferguson's (1993) reports of student grade point average do not substantiate that these students were any less intelligent than others. Perhaps the symbiotic nature of the group experience may unwittingly evolve into an enabling advisor/compliant student four year relationship. It should be noted, consequently, that the percentage of subjects who had taken this course was relatively small and this could account for some of the unexpected differences. However, the sample was in relative proportion to the percentage of students participating in grouped advisement, and is therefore considered representative.

In general, one must wonder why some students gain campus awareness, while others do not. Perhaps transfer students and undergraduates scrutinizing their major course of study have heightened campus awareness by necessity. If a timely graduation is to be accomplished, it is largely due to personal effort. A grouped advisement participant, on the other hand, may enjoy the luxury of having their problems solved through faculty advisor intervention. It would be interesting for further research to investigate where students report gaining knowledge of various people and policies. It has been shown, for instance, that grouped advisement students lack the campus awareness of other students. It would be worthwhile to assess whether these students lack the resources, or merely the desire, to learn which is found in the more knowledgeable students. Regardless, campus personnel should be aware of the need to educate students more thoroughly on these fundamental issues.

Campus services in particular are vital to a students' success. The simple manipulation of the pass/fail option can make monumental differences in student grade point averages. For these reasons quality academic advising is essential. As noted earlier, students have awarded academic advisement and student services their lowest satisfaction ratings (Asin, 1993). Perhaps these two issues are related. If students are not appropriately informed, or are not retaining information regarding student support services, the less they will be able to employ them. Many colleges are reporting high percentages of students not satisfied with their academic advisement, and low percentages of students who consult with their academic advisor on a regular basis (Matthews, Troy & Wilder, 1993; Lonabocker, 1987). This lack of contact or quality contact could have an enormous impact on student awareness scores and, therefore, on understanding of campus services. It has been shown that effective academic advisement is related to student retention (Astone, Nunez-Wormack, & Smoldacka, 1989) and the present paper would propose that campus awareness is also an associated variable.

Employing the notion of "student consumerism," the college has an obligation to educate students on many of the issues tested in the present study. Whether information takes the form of academic advisement, orientation programs, or informational seminars, more effort is needed to ensure that students are aware of campus related issues. Regardless of the substantial energies put forth by the college community to achieve these goals, progress still needs to be made before all students on this campus gain an appropriate and working knowledge of campus personnel, policies, and student services.

References

- Astin, A. (1993). What matters in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astione, B., Nunez-Wormack, E., & Smolacka, I. (1989). Intensive academic advisement. NASSP Bulletin, 72, 113-114.
- Balrick, H. B. (1984). Semantic memory content in permastore. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 113, 1-29.
- Brookfield, S. (1991). Understanding and facilitating adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, J. (1976). An analysis of recognition and recall and problems in their comparison. In J. Brown (Ed.), Recall and recognition, New York: Wiley.
- Chickering, A., Lynch, A., & Schlossberg, N. (1989). Improving higher education environments for adults: Responsive programs and services from entry to departure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ferguson, M. (1993). Role of faculty in freshman seminars. College Student Personnel Association Journal of New York State, 92-93, 13-21.
- Harrison, C., & Varcoe, K. (1984). Orienting transfer students. In M. L. Upcraft (Ed.), Orienting students to college: New directions for student services, 25, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lonabocker, L. (1987). Freshman registration and advisement. College and University, 62, 341-344.
- Matthews, T., Troy, M., & Wilder, A. (1993). Sources of advisement information. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 232.
- Rentz, A. (1988). Orientation. In Rentz & Saddleire (Eds.), Student affairs functions in higher education. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Rotella, J. (1993). On being human with adult learners and its relationship to the future of college student personnel. College Student Personnel Association Journal of New York State, 92-93, 31-39.
- Schacter, D. L. (1987). Implicit memory: History and current status. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 13, 501-518.

The elements, features, themes, assumptions, and values of the Multidimensional Campus Violence Intervention Model are already in place on most campuses. The model can serve as an organizing outline for the prevention of campus violence, with innovations, experiments, unique designs, and evaluation built upon the base of established practice.

Figure 1

The Multidimensional Campus Violence Intervention Model

Questions	Actions	Elements
1. How do we make our standards known?	Develop and Communicate	Policies Procedures
2. How do we meet our goals?	Establish	Group Efforts
3. What physical changes are needed?	Evaluate and Improve	Security Measures
4. What needs to be learned?	Implement	Educational Programming -- violence awareness -- skills development -- attitude exploration
5. How can we help those most in need?	Provide	Services -- judicial -- advocacy -- medical -- counseling -- protective
6. What information is needed?	Analyze	Data -- incident reports -- research studies -- service effectiveness

CSPA Membership Survey Report
June 1993

John Ellis, M.S.Ed.

Chair of CSPA Research and Information
Coordinator, Alcohol & Drug Prevention Services
The College of Saint Rose

In March of 1993, 320 surveys were mailed out and by mid April 135 were returned for a return rate of 42%. The use of open ended questions provided useful information but slowed down the generation of this report. Overall, the survey results indicate that the members are satisfied with CSPA but there are several areas of concern.

One of the main concerns is communication. Many respondents were either disappointed with or unaware of the existence of the newsletter and/or journal. Also, many members indicated that they felt that there is a lack of communication between the Executive Board, the Regional Coordinators, and the members. Many members also believe that there is a clique or in-group that keeps other members from becoming involved. This perception may be a hindrance to members who want to become more involved with CSPA. This overall lack of communication is probably the reason why many members reported that CSPA is disorganized.

Another area that needs to be addressed is regional activities. Many members expressed interest and/or concern with regional activities. Perhaps the Executive Board should focus more on the regions by communication more with Regional Coordinators, promoting and attending regional activities, offering CSPA workshops or programs in different regions, visiting CSPA members at various colleges, and showing that we are indeed a "Grass Root" organization. One survey respondent suggested that we offer an orientation package to new members with a membership directory and CSPA history, jokes, and terminology. This might encourage members to be more active at the regional and state levels.

Overall, the membership seems to be content with what CSPA has to offer them. The three things liked most about CSPA are networking; the relaxed, casual, friendly atmosphere; and the annual conference. These are things that we tend to do well. The only "service that we should offer in the future", that was significantly mentioned, is Placement Services or a Placement Conference. Based on the results of this survey, it seems that we need to improve what we already offer as a professional association (especially communication, organization, and regional activities) and then consider adding placement services for our members.

The following pages list the summarized results of the membership survey. The responses to the open ended questions were paraphrased and grouped into similar categories to facilitate this report and to save a few trees worth of paper. The open ended questions provided us with many explicit comments, suggestions, and criticisms from our membership. I tried to include all of the comments that I believe will be useful to the membership. Please take the time to review all of the survey results because if our members cared enough to share their thoughts with us, then we should at least care enough to hear what they are saying.

1. What is your current career status?

Employed full time in higher education	116	85.5%
Average number of years	9.3	
Employed part time in higher education	10	7.4%
Average number of years	2.7	
Employed full time in a non-college setting	5	3.7%
Employed part time in a non-college setting	3	2.2%

2. Total number of years in higher education work

Years:			
0-5	52	38.5%	
6-10	40	29.6%	
11-15	14	10.3%	
16-20	13	9.6%	
21-25	6	4.4%	
26+	10	7.4%	

3. If you are not employed in higher education, are you actively seeking a position?

Yes	7	88%
-----	---	-----

(of those not employed in higher ed)

4. Highest degree earned

Bachelors	18	13.3%
Masters	102	75.6%
Doctorate	14	10.4%

5. Currently enrolled in graduate studies?

Yes, part time	27	20.0%
Yes, full time	10	7.4%
Level		
Masters	25	67.6%
Doctoral	11	29.7%

6. Planning on pursuing an advanced or terminal degree?

Yes	70	51.9%
-----	----	-------

6a. What area?

Higher Education	23
Educational Administration	10

Counseling/Counseling Psychology
 Psychology
 School Counseling
 Other

6
3
2
11

NCDA
 ACES
 Other

4
2
41

3.0%
 1.5%
 30.37%

7. Area of Involvement/Interest

Residence Life
 Administration
 Counseling
 Judicial Affairs
 Activities/Unions
 Alcohol Programming
 Career Development
 Academic Advising
 Teaching/Faculty
 Campus Safety
 Other
 Adult Students
 Greek Affairs
 Minority Student Services
 Health Services
 International Students
 Admissions
 Athletics
 Disabled Student Services
 Learning Support Services
 Registrar/Records
 Continuing Education
 Alumni Relations
 EOP/HEOP
 Financial Aid

75
48
40
33
32
32
29
26
26
24
24
20
17
16
16
15
14
12
12
12
11
11
5
4
4
3

55.6%
 35.6%
 29.6%
 24.4%
 23.7%
 23.7%
 21.5%
 19.3%
 19.3%
 17.8%
 17.8%
 14.8%
 12.6%
 11.9%
 11.9%
 11.1%
 10.4%
 8.9%
 8.9%
 8.9%
 8.3%
 8.3%
 8.3.%
 3.7%
 3.0%
 3.0%
 2.2%

8. Professional Membership

ACPA
 NASPA
 ACUHOI
 ACA
 ACUI
 NAWE
 AFA

64
60
24
14
9
7
5

47.4%
 44.4%
 17.8%
 10.4%
 6.7%
 5.2%
 3.7%

9. Conference attendance past three years

Attended at least 1 conference in past three years

Yes

123

91.1%

Conferences

CSPA
 ACPA
 NASPA
 NEACUHO
 ACU-I
 NACADA
 NACA
 ACA
 OSHKOSH
 FIPSE

82
44
43
13
6
6
5
3
2
2

60.7%
 32.6%
 31.9%
 9.6%
 4.4%
 4.4%
 3.7%
 2.2%
 1.5%
 1.5%

10. Conference plans during next year

Plan to attend a conference during next year

Yes

96

71.1%

CSPA
 NASPA
 ACPA
 ACU-I
 NACA
 NACADA
 ACUHOI
 NEACUHO
 FIPSE
 NAWE

63
30
28
7
5
5
3
2
2
2

46.7%
 22.2%
 20.7%
 5.2%
 3.7%
 3.7%
 3.7%
 2.2%
 1.5%
 1.5%

11. Professional Activities (Programs, Seminars, etc.)

Yes

34

25.2%

12. Past CSPA Involvement

Yes	46	34.07%
<u>Type of Involvement</u>		
Conference Presenter	22	
Conference Committees	21	
Regional Workshops/Programs	19	
Regional Programming Committee	15	
Newsletter/Journal Writer/Editor	12	
Executive Board	11	
Regional Coordinator	6	
Placement Activities	4	
Multicultural Committee	4	
Wellness Committee	1	

13. Past Involvement with other organizations

Yes	37	27.4%
<u>Type of Involvement</u>		
Conferences Presentations	10	
Conference Chair/Planner	6	
Committee Work	4	
Regional Activities	2	
Placement Activities	2	

14. Rating of CSPA Service

1 = Very Important	2 = Important	3 = Not too important	4 = Not important at all
<u>Average Rating</u>			
Networking	1.7		
Annual Conference	2.0		
Regional Workshops and Programs	2.1		
Newsletter	2.2		
Journal	2.5		
Placement Services	2.8		
Other	3.9		

15. How to improve services

Improve/consistent publications	26	19.3%
Improve communications	22	16.3%
More or better regional activities	8	5.9%
Have Regional Coordinators do more	6	4.4%
Improve what we already offer	4	3.0%
Placement services/placement conference	4	3.0%
Improve mailing lists/labels	3	2.2%
Get more people involved	3	2.2%
Provide membership directory	3	2.2%
Improve networking	3	2.2%
Computer access through network or database	1	0.7%
Don't let CSPA be "Saint Rose"	1	0.7%
More money for regions	1	0.7%
Direct more services to mid level administrators	1	0.7%
Make conference more affordable for new professionals	1	0.7%

16. Services CSPA should offer in the future

Placement Services/Placement Conference*	17	12.6%
Mentor Program - continuous year round	3	2.2%
Better communications	2	1.5%
More Regional Programs	2	1.5%
Retreats/Mixers	2	1.5%
Traveling workshops	1	0.7%
More graduate student programs	1	0.7%
Less emphasis on programs for new professionals	1	0.7%
More emphasis on Adult Education	1	0.7%
Downstate Conference	1	0.7%
Long Island Regional Conference	1	0.7%
Internships	1	0.7%
Transferable Job Skills workshop	1	0.7%
Improved long term planning	1	0.7%
Better conference	1	0.7%

17. What do you like best about CSPA?

Networking	47	34.8%
Relaxed, casual atmosphere, warmth, friendliness	22	16.3%
Conference	14	10.4%
Grass Roots orientation	6	4.4%

The members/people	5	3.7%
Silver Bay	3	2.2%
Regional activities	3	2.2%
Easy to get involved	3	2.2%
Newsletter	2	1.5%
Information	2	1.5%
Communication	2	1.5%
Receptive to graduate students	2	1.5%
Placement Services	1	0.7%
Commitment to diversity	1	0.7%
Professionalism	1	0.7%
New York focus	1	0.7%
Mentoring	1	0.7%
Journal	1	0.7%

18. What do you like least about CSPA?

Lack of communication	16	11.9%
Disorganized	12	8.9%
Clique at top; In-group nepotism	11	8.1%
Quality/frequency of newsletter	9	6.7%
Little involvement/activity at regional level	5	3.7%
Too many special interest groups	3	2.2%
Lost focus/Not grass roots anymore	3	2.2%
Poor attitude of members	2	1.5%
Mistakes on mailing list	2	1.5%
Expense/Conference expense	2	1.5%
Lack of people of color	1	0.7%
Seems to geared to Central NYS and Manhattan	1	0.7%
Election system/nominations	1	0.7%
Distant from members	1	0.7%
Conferences not spread out through state	1	0.7%
Too much emphasis on Residence Life & Activities	1	0.7%
Too much focus on past CSPA history	1	0.7%
Too much focus on past CSPA history	1	0.7%
CSPA is Saint Rose attitude	1	0.7%

19. Specific recommendations

Let other people get involved in Executive Board	8	5.9%
Communication to members better	8	5.9%
Improve Newsletter	4	3.0%
Provide more/better regional activities	3	2.2%

More programs for experienced professionals	2	1.5%
Orientation packet for new members (history, jokes, terminology, directory)	2	1.5%
Include all members	2	1.5%
Organize/train regional leadership	2	1.5%
Ongoing recruitment of people of color	1	0.7%
Vary conference planning committee members	1	0.7%
Committee chairs should be elected	1	0.7%
More meetings	1	0.7%
Balance leadership between new/experienced professionals	1	0.7%
Create a diverse think tank	1	0.7%
Spread conferences around the state	1	0.7%
More programs for experienced professionals	1	0.7%
More Executive Board activity and clarity	1	0.7%
Outside consultant and evaluation training for all officers	1	0.7%
Get organized	1	0.7%
Let Regional Coordinators review/correct membership lists	1	0.7%
More teamwork, less competitiveness	1	0.7%

20. Should we continue to hold the conference at Silver Bay every other year?

Yes	54	40.0%
Not Sure	37	27.4%
Hold it at Silver Bay Every Year	23	17.0%
No	20	14.8%

Other Suggested Conference Locations

Central NYS	6	Kiamasha Lake	1
Buffalo	5	Oswego	1
Long Island	4	Utica/Rome	1
(40 colleges)	4	Fredonia	1
Syracuse	4	Old Forge	1
New York City	3	Thousand Islands	1
Lake Placid	3	Catskills	1
Albany	2	Cortland	1
Downstate/	2	Alexandria Bay	1
Westchester	1	Corning	1
Hudson Valley	1	Finger Lakes	1

Regional Combinations		
Central NYS, Syracuse, Oswego	11	8.1%
Long Island, New York City, Downstate, Westchester	9	6.7%
Buffalo, Western NYS	5	3.7%

21. Should we continue to hold the conference in late September or early October?

Yes	95	70.4%
No	22	16.3%

Other suggested times of the year for the conference

Late October/Early November	10	7.4%
Summer	9	6.7%
Spring	3	2.2%

22. Topics for future pre-conference workshops

Career Planning/Job Search/PhD's	6	4.4%
Law and Higher Education	4	3.0%
Diversity	4	3.0%
Total Quality Management	4	3.0%
Parent Programming/Dual Career Couples/Working Women with Children	3	2.2%
Safety/Security	3	2.2%
Fun/Humor/Activities	3	2.2%
Wellness	2	1.5%
Status of Higher Ed in US	2	1.5%
Alcohol Issues	2	1.5%
Stress/Avoiding Burn out	2	1.5%
AIDS	2	1.5%
Mediation Training	2	1.5%
Computer/Technology	2	1.5%
New Professionals Programs	2	1.5%
Academic & Vocational Counseling Issues	2	1.5%
How does CSPA fit into ACPA?	1	0.7%
Time Management	1	0.7%
Ropes Course Training	1	0.7%
Adult Education	1	0.7%
Communication	1	0.7%
Sexual Harassment	1	0.7%

23. Did you attend to 1992 CSPA Conference in Binghamton?

Yes	59	43.7%
-----	----	-------

Doing More with Less	1	0.7%
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Issues	1	0.7%
Political Correctness	1	0.7%
Grant Writing	1	0.7%
Budgeting	1	0.7%
Values Education	1	0.7%
Non-Traditional Students	1	0.7%

23a. What did you like best about the '92 CSPA Conference?

Networking	19	32.2%
Workshops	15	25.4%
Agape	10	16.9%
Keynote Speaker	4	6.8%
Placement Services	4	6.8%
Creativity Theme	3	5.1%
Karaoke	3	5.1%
Small size/not crowded	3	5.1%
Activities	2	3.4%
Location	2	3.4%
Hospitality	1	1.7%
Presenting	1	1.7%
Disappointed	1	1.7%

23b. If you didn't attend, why not?

Conflicts/time constraints	19	
Other	9	
Lack of funding	8	
Too Far	7	
Fall is too busy	4	
Didn't want to	3	
Didn't know about it	1	
Lack of childcare	1	
Sent most of staff	1	

24. Other thoughts, comments, suggestions

- Too busy to be involved in CSPA activities 4 3.0%
- Glad to see survey 4 3.0%
- What Newsletter/Journal? 4 3.0%
- Great Job CSPA 2 1.5%
- Reconsidering CSPA membership 1 0.7%
- More consistency with Newsletter 1 0.7%
- We need to get back to our values and origins 1 0.7%
- CSPA is basically an Albany based group 1 0.7%
- Expand the membership and leadership 1 0.7%
- Keep it going - quality organization 1 0.7%
- Improve process for recruiting Regional Coordinators and Executive Board positions 1 0.7%
- Membership year should start in August 1 0.7%

Optional Demographic Information

25. Gender
- Female 83 61.5%
 - Male 47 34.8%
 - No Answer 5 3.7%

26. Average Age 33.5

27. Cultural Background
- African American 4 3.0%
 - Caucasian 116 85.9%
 - Hispanic 8 5.9%
 - Native American 0 0.0%
 - Asian American 0 0.0%
 - Other 0 0.0%
 - No Answer 7 5.2%

28. Sexual Orientation
- Bisexual 4 3.0%
 - Gay/Lesbian 7 5.2%
 - Heterosexual 106 78.5%
 - Other 0 0.0%
 - No Answer 18 13.3%

Membership Application
College Student Personnel Association of New York State, Inc.
Membership Year October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1995

Instructions: Please Print or Type. Address is used for all correspondence and will be published in the CSPA Membership Directory.

Last Name _____ First Name _____ A.C.P.A. number _____
 Application Type: New Renewal Membership Status: Regular Student
 Complete Mailing Address: Street _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____
 City _____ State _____ Institution _____
 Title _____ Daytime Phone (____) _____ Fax Number (____) _____

- Demographics: (Check all that apply)
- Male Female
 - Caucasian African-American
 - Native-American Latino/a
 - Other _____

- Primary Work Setting:
- Proprietary Public 4 year Private 2 year
 - Fed./State/Local Business Government
 - Private 4 year Other _____

- Work Responsibility:
- Academic Advisor Career Development Health Services
 - Activities/Unions Continuing Education Housing
 - Administration Counseling Registrar/Records
 - Admissions EOP/HIOP Residence Life
 - Alumni Relations Financial Aid Teaching Faculty
 - Campus Relations Foreign Student Other _____

- Areas of Interest or Service:
- Alcohol & Drug Regional Programs Adult and Non-Traditional Learners
 - Annual Conference Research Graduate Students
 - Journal Multicultural Affairs Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Awareness
 - Wellness Women's Issues Newsletter

Student Members: Your major professor must sign the following statement:
 I certify that the person named is currently enrolled in 9 or more credits in a graduate program in Student Personnel or related field.

Signature _____ Date _____
 Institution _____

CSPA Subscribes to all Federal, State and SUNY legal requirements and does not discriminate on the basis of race, sexual/affectional orientation, religion, age, handicap, marital status, veteran status, arrest or conviction record.

Annual Dues: Professional Members: \$ 20.00 Graduate Students: \$ 10.00
 Checks should be made payable to CSPA/NYS. Please staple check to bottom right of page. The opposite side of this sheet is addressed for your convenience.

Please
place
postage
here

Susan Potts
CSPA Treasurer
Testing Office, Guenther Loft
Hudson Valley Community College
Troy, NY 12180